Attorney docket TAIW 155

REMARKS

In response to the outstanding office action:

[2-4] Correction is made as suggested.

[5-8] Claims 1-8 were rejected under §112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Addressing the bulleted points of ¶7, page 3: the present amendments to claim 1 changes "common" to "same" to and eliminates "comparing;" using a prescribed condition to select the texture is supported in lines 4-9 on page 6; on page 4, line 15 of claim 1 is supported in Fig. 3 and lines 10-20 on page 6; "plaquette" is deleted; and restoring the polygon is respectfully submitted to be within the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

Claim 4 is supported in Fig.2 and lines 12-26 on page 5.

[9-11] Claims 6-8 were rejected under §112, second paragraph. The term "plaquette," which was the basis of the rejection, is removed.

[12-21] Claims 1-8 were rejected under §103 over Debevec in view of Teo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(1) Debevec uses "blocks" such as prisms or rectangular parallelepipeds (Figs. 3-4). The rejection takes these "blocks" to be the same as the Applicants' "polygons," but Debevec actively teaches against using polygons (page 15, middle of first column just above bullets listing advantages of "blocks") and therefore teaches against claim 1, reciting "dividing [the image and the texture mapping] into a plurality of polygons." Section 3 of Debevec on page 17 does not mention polygons, but instead discloses matching of pixels.

(2) Debevec teaches "weighted averaging" to smooth the edges of overlapped imaged. The Applicants discussed the disadvantages of this method in lines 4-9 on page 2.

AMENDMENT   7   *10/626,698*

(3) Teo relates to 2D images and Debevec relates to 3D images. 3D images are more complicate than 2D images because the sizes of overlapped 2D images are uniform while the sizes of 3D images are not. Due to variable direction of 3D images, the size of each texture is different. It is not trivial to combine a 2D images technique and a 3D images technique. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that it is unreasonable to combine Teo and Debevec.

The dependent claims are patentable for depending from claim 1.

Respectfully submitted,

May 5, 2005
Date

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
(717) 426-1664
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 703-872-9306) on May 5, 2005.

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]   Signature _____

AMENDMENT   8   *10/626,698*